

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants originally submitted Claims 1-14. In a previous response, Claims 6-7 and 10-13 were canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and Claim 14 was withdrawn. In the present response, Claim 1 has been amended. Support for the amendment can be found, for example, in Figure 8 of the original specification. No other claims have been added or canceled. Accordingly, Claims 1-5 and 8-9 are currently pending in the application.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-2, 4-5, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-2, 4-5, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,841,624 to Xu, *et al.* ("Xu") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,106,630 to Frankel ("Frankel"), U.S. Patent No. 6,146,504 to Patadia, *et al.* ("Patadia"), and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0029895 by Hanamachi, *et al.* ("Hanamachi"). The Applicants believe the invention as presently claimed however, is neither shown nor suggested in the cited combination of Xu, Frankel, Patadia, and Hanamachi. More specifically, the Applicants fail to find where the cited combination teaches or suggest a removable, detachable pedestal slip cover overlying a planar upper surface of a chuck and extending laterally beyond sidewalls of the chuck and below the planar upper surface along a portion of the sidewall providing a slippable detachment of the slip cover as recited in now amended independent Claim 1.

The Examiner recognizes that the combination of Xu, Frankel, and Patadia fails to teach or suggest that the cover is a removable, detachable pedestal slip cover and cites Hanamachi to cure this deficiency of the combination of Xu, Frankel, and Patadia. (*See* Final Rejection of December 16,

2007, pages 4-5.) Claim 1, however, has been amended to more clearly point out that the slip cover overlying a planar upper surface of a chuck extends laterally beyond the sidewalls of a chuck and below the planar upper surface along a portion of the sidewall of the chuck. Hanamachi teaches cover plate 2 that covers the entire surface of a ceramic heater 1. (*See*, for example, paragraph 22 and Figures 1-3.) The Applicants fail to find any teaching or suggestion in Hanamachi that the cover plate extends laterally beyond the sidewalls and below an upper surface of the ceramic heater 1 of Hanamachi. As such, Hanamachi, in view of the amendment, does not cure the above-noted deficiencies of the cited combination of Xu, Frankel, and Patadia.

Thus, the cited combination of Xu, Frankel, Patadia, and Hanamachi does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness for presently amended independent Claim 1 and Claims that depend thereon. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claims 1-2, 4-5, and 9 and allow issuance thereof.

II. Rejection of Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Xu, Frankel, Patadia, and Hanamachi as applied to Claims 1-2, 4-5, and 9 and in further view of Applicants' admitted prior art. As established above, the cited combination of Xu, Frankel, Patadia, and Hanamachi does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness for presently amended independent Claim 1. The Examiner has not cited Applicants' admitted prior art to cure the above-noted deficiencies of the cited combination but to teach the subject matter of dependent Claim 3. (*See* Final Rejection of December 19, 2007, page 6.) Additionally, the Applicants do not find where

Applicants' admitted prior art cures the above-noted deficiencies of the cited combination. As such, the above cited combination and Applicants' admitted prior art, as applied by the Examiner, does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of amended independent Claim 1 and Claims that depend thereon. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claim 3 and allow issuance thereof.

III. Rejection of Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Xu, Frankel, Patadia, and Hanamachi as applied to Claims 1-2, 4-5, and 9 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,656,093 to Burkhardt, *et al.* ("Burkhardt"). As established above, the cited combination of Xu, Frankel, Patadia, and Hanamachi does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness for amended independent Claim 1. The Examiner has not cited Burkhardt to cure the above-noted deficiencies of the cited combination but to teach the subject matter of dependent Claim 8. (*See* Final Rejection of December 19, 2007, page 7.) Additionally, the Applicants do not find where Burkhardt cures the above-noted deficiencies of the cited combination. As such, the above cited combination and Burkhardt, as applied by the Examiner, does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of independent Claim 1 and Claims that depend thereon. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claim 8 and allow issuance thereof.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicants now see all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicit a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-5 and 8-9.

The Applicants request the Examiner to telephone the undersigned agent of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, credits or overpayments to Deposit Account 08-2395.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, PC

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Steven J. Hanke".

Steven J. Hanke
Registration No. 58,076

Dated: February 19, 2008

P.O. Box 832570
Richardson, Texas 75083
(972) 480-8800